1	AARON D. FORD		
2	Attorney General SUSAN K. STEWART (BAR No. 9914)		
3	Deputy Attorney General State of Nevada		
	Office of the Attorney General		
4	100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701-4717		
5	Telephone: (775) 684-4173 E-Mail: SStewart@ag.nv.gov		
6	STEVEN M. GOLDSTEIN (Bar. No. 6318) Senior Deputy Attorney General Office of the Attorney General 1184 Western Avenue, Build 3 Las Vegas, Nevada 89012		
7			
8			
	Telephone: (702) 730-3400		
9	Email: SGoldstein@ag.nv.gov		
.0	Attorneys for the Nevada State Public Works Division and State of Nevada, ex rel. Department of Transportation		
1			
$\lfloor 2 \rfloor$	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
.3	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
4	EDWARD E. SEELY,	Case No.: 2:20-cv-02109-CDS-VCF	
15	Plaintiff,	Case 110 2.20 et 02107 CBS 1 C1	
6	vs.		
17	NEVADA STATE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO EXTEND	
18	INDIVIDUALS BRENTON MARSHALL AND JOHN/JANE DOES (1-20); NDOT	TIME TO RESPOND TO MOTION TO DISMISS [ECF. 42] and MOTION TO	
19	INDIVIDUALS MARIO GOMEZ P.E., JOHN/JANE DOES (1-20),	DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO QUASH [ECF. 44]	
20	Defendants.		
21			
22	Pursuant to Local Rule IA 6-1, Defendant, Benton Marshall of the Nevada State Public Work		
23	Division, (erroneously sued as Brenton Marshall) by and through counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Attorne		
24	General of the State of Nevada, and Susan K. Stewart, Deputy Attorney General/Construction Lav		
25	Counsel, and Defendant, Mario Gomez, through counsel, P.E. Steven M. Goldstein, Senior Deput		
26	Attorney General, Attorney for Defendant, Mario Gomez of the State of Nevada ex rel. Department of		
27	Transportation sued solely in his individual capacity, and Plaintiff Edward E. Seely, in proper person		
28	respectfully submits the following Stipulation and Order to Extend Time to Respond to Motion to		

1 2 Dismiss [ECF. 42], and Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion to Quash [ECF. 44]. This Stipulation for such an extension is entered by the parties in good faith and not for the purpose of delay.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

A. Reasons why the Deadlines Were not Satisfied

Defendant, Benton Marshall (erroneously sued as Brenton Marshall), filed a Motion to Dismiss [ECF. 42] (hereinafter "Motion to Dismiss [ECF. 42]") on July 7, 2022; Mario Gomez, filed a Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] (hereinafter "Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Quash [ECF. 44]") on July 7, 2022. Plaintiff contacted counsel requesting an extension, necessitated by a conflict in his medical treatment. Unfortunately, for various reasons, Plaintiff's messages were not received. After receipt of [ECF. 50], Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time of 30 days to Respond to Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss [ECF. 42] and Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Quash [ECF. 44], counsel immediately contacted Plaintiff. After communications with Plaintiff and the filing of Plaintiffs Motion for Extension of Time of 30 Days to Respond to Defendants Motion to Dismiss [ECF. 42] and Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Quash [ECF. 44], the parties have agreed and stipulated to, an extension of deadlines to file the oppositions and replies.

В. **Proposed Schedule**

The parties propose that the current deadlines be extended as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff's Opposition Briefs - The current deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss [ECF.42] was July 22, 2022. The current deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] is July 29, 2022. All parties have agreed to and the requested extension and the new deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to both Motion's [ECF.42] and [ECF. 44] is September 2, 2022.
- 2. Defendants' Reply Briefs - The current deadline for Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss [ECF.42] was July 29, 2022. The current deadline for Defendants Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss or Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] is August 5, 2022, with the requested extension the new deadline for both Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion [ECF. 42] and [ECF. 44] is **September**

///

///

9, 2022

1	For the foregoing reasons, the Defendants, Benton Marshall of the Public Works Division, Mario		
2	Gomez, and Plaintiff, Edward Seely, hereby stipulate to the above extensions.		
3			
4	DATED this <u>3rd</u> day of August 2022.		
5			
6	AARON D. FORD Attorney General	AARON D. FORD Attorney General	
7		•	
8	/s/ Susan K. Stewart Susan K. Stewart (Bar No. 9914)	/s/ Steven M. Goldstein Steven M. Goldstein (Bar No. 6318)	
9	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants,	Senior Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for State of Nevada, ex rel.	
10	Public Works Division and	Department of Transportation and	
11	Defendant Benton Marshall, erroneously sued as Brenton Marshall	Defendant, Mario Gomez	
12			
13		Seely v. Nevada State Public Works et al. 2:20-cv-02109-CDS-VCF	
14	DATED this <u>3rd</u> day of August 2022		
15			
16	/s/ Edward E. Seely Edward E. Seely		
17	453 N. 11 th Street, Spt. B		
18	Las Vegas, NV 89101 Plaintiff, In Proper Person		
19			
20			
21			
22 23			
23			
$\begin{bmatrix} 24 \\ 25 \end{bmatrix}$			
26			
27			
28			

ORDER

Based on the foregoing stipulation of the parties, the deadlines outlined above shall be extended as follows:

- 1. The current deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss [ECF.42] was July 21 22, 2022. The current deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] is July 29, 2022. All parties have agreed to and the requested extension and the new deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion's [ECF.42] and [ECF. 44] is September 2, 2022.
- 2. The current deadline for Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion [ECF.42] was July 29, 2022. The current deadline for Defendants Reply to Opposition to Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] is August 5, 2022, with the requested extension the new deadline for Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion [ECF. 42] and [ECF. 44] is September 9, 2022.

IT IS ORDERED that the new deadline for Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion's [ECF.42] and [ECF. 44] is September 2, 2022. This new deadline is effective, *nun pro tunc*, to July 21, 2022.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the new deadline for Defendant's Reply in Support of Motion [ECF. 42] and [ECF. 44] is September 9, 2022. This new deadline is effective, *nun pro tunc*, to July 29, 2022.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Dismiss or Quash (ECF No. 50) is DENIED as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Stipulation and Order to Extend Time to Respond to Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Dismiss or Quash (ECF No. 52) is STRICKEN as a duplicate.

DATED August 8, 2022.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

From: Steven M. Goldstein
To: Susan L. Messina

 Cc:
 Mary J. Pizzariello; Susan K. Stewart

 Subject:
 RE: Seely v. State of Nevada

Date: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 2:13:01 PM

This looks good to me. Please use my electronic signature for this Proposed SAO.

Kindest regards,

Steven M. Goldstein Senior Deputy Attorney General

Transportation Division
Nevada Office of the Attorney General
1184 Western Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89102
(702) 730-3414
sgoldstein@ag.nv.gov



Notice: This e-mail message and any attachments thereto may contain confidential, privileged, or non-public information. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this information by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy all copies.

From: Susan L. Messina <SMessina@ag.nv.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 12:19 PM
To: Steven M. Goldstein <sgoldstein@ag.nv.gov>

Cc: Mary J. Pizzariello <MPizzariello@ag.nv.gov>; Susan K. Stewart <SStewart@ag.nv.gov>

Subject: Seely v. State of Nevada

Good afternoon Mr. Goldstein,

Attached please find the Stipulation and Order to Extend Time to Respond to Motion to Dismiss [ECF. 42] and Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Motion to Quash [ECF. 44] for your review and if acceptable your approval. Please advise if any changes need to be made, otherwise, if the document meets with your approval, please confirm in writing that you are agreeable to use of your e-signature for filing with the court.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact either Susan Stewart or me.

Sincerely,

Susan Messina Legal Secretary II State of Nevada Office of the Attorney General 100 North Carson Street Carson City, NV 89701

<u>smessina@ag.nv.gov</u> T: 775.684.1210



Notice of Confidentiality:

This preceding e-mail message and accompanying documents are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. SS 2510-2521, and contain information intended for the specific individual(s) only or constitute non-public information. This information may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that you have received this document in error and that any review, dissemination, copying, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify me immediately by E-mail, and delete the original message. Use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Susan K. Stewart
To: Susan L. Messina

Subject: FW:

Date: Thursday, August 4, 2022 8:19:41 AM

Here you go. Thank you!

From: Ed Seely <dancingman4life@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 4:00 PM
To: Susan K. Stewart <SStewart@ag.nv.gov>

Subject:

<u>WARNING</u> - This email originated from outside the State of Nevada. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Yes I approve go ahead and file it